

REMARKS

This Supplemental Amendment is in response to the Office Action, dated April 7, 2005 in which Applicants' Amendment, dated January 11, 2005, was deemed not fully responsive to the August 11, 2004 Office Action. Specifically, Applicants' January 11, 2005 Amendment was deemed not fully responsive because Applicants allegedly did not specifically point out what element(s) in newly added claims 47-55 distinguishes over the cited references.

In Applicants' January 11, 2005 Amendment, claims 18, 23, 37, and 38 were cancelled, claims 1, 3-6, 11, 14, 17, 19-22, 31, 32, and 39 were amended, and new claims 47-55 were added. Claims 25-29 currently stand allowed, and claims 2, 7-10, 30, 40-44, and 46 have been withdrawn but are still pending in the application. This Supplemental Amendment further amends claims 31, 48, 49, 50, 54, and 55 to attend to minor typographical errors identified in Applicants' review of the January 11, 2005 Amendment. Entry of the amendments to claims 31, 48, 49, 50, 54, and 55 is respectfully requested.

RESPONSE TO ALLEGED DEFECTS

Newly added claims 47-50 in Applicants' January 11, 2005 Amendment depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1 and further define the claimed invention. As new claims 47-50 include all of the limitations of amended independent claim 1, new claims 47-50 are allowable for all the reasons discussed in Applicants' January 11, 2005 Amendment with respect to amended independent claim 1. Moreover, Applicants' further respectfully submit that none of the references cited in the August 11, 2004 Office Action teach or suggest a fluid control module and/or automated valve adapted to stop flow of injection fluid at any pressure or flow rate when no force is applied to the actuator to deliver a sharp bolus of

injection fluid as claimed in new claims 47-49. In fact, the cited references are silent on this claimed feature of the injector system.

Similarly, newly added claims 51-55 depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 19 and further define the claimed invention. As new claims 51-55 include all of the limitations of amended independent claim 19, new claims 51-55 are allowable for all the reasons discussed in Applicants' January 11, 2005 Amendment with respect to amended independent claim 19. As identified previously, the references cited in the August 11, 2004 Office Action fail to teach or suggest a fluid control module and/or automated valve adapted to stop flow of injection fluid at any pressure or flow rate when no force is applied to the first control to deliver a sharp bolus of injection fluid as claimed in new claims 53-55.

Accordingly, for the detailed reasons set forth in Applicants' January 11, 2005 Amendment and the additional reasons set forth herein, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 41-55 further distinguish over the references cited in the August 11, 2004 Office Action and are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants have addressed the alleged defects with the January 11, 2005 Amendment and respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and such is respectfully requested.

The undersigned submits this document pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.34(a) and is authorized to file this Supplemental Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.

By _____

Christian E. Schuster
Registration No. 43,908
Attorney for Applicants